

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 15-18 are now presented for examination. Claims 1-8 and 15-18 have been amended. Claim 9 has been cancelled. Claims 10-14, 19 and 20 have been withdrawn. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 and 15 are independent.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner requires that Applicant elects a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Applicant elects Group I, Figures 1-5 and 8-10, directed towards Claims 1-9 and 15-18. Accordingly, Claims 10-14, 19 and 20 have been withdrawn.

On page 4 of the Office Action, The Examiner objects to the drawings because Applicant failed to use the proper cross sectional shading when showing the invention with a cross sectional view. Corrected drawing sheets are herein submitted.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the Abstract of Disclosure. Applicant herein has amended the Abstract of Disclosure.

On page 6 of the Office Action, Claim 15 is objected to because it includes more than one capital letter on line 6. Applicant has herein made the appropriate correction.

On page 6 of the Office Action, Claims 1-9 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended Claims 1-3, 7, 8, and 15. Claim 9 has been cancelled. The remaining claims depend from independent Claims

1 and 15, respectively. The Claim amendments are believed to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, thus placing the claims in condition for allowance.

On page 7 of the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kellner, U.S. Patent No. 2,732,596. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. Kellner '596 discloses a draught preventer consisting of "a tube 1" having a fastening strip "connected to the tube 1 so that its plane is tangential to the circumference of the tube." (Column 1, Lines 69-72). Moreover, "the fastening strip 2 consists of adhesive material or is covered with an adhesive layer 3," (Column 1, Line 72- Column 3, Line 1).

In the present application, Claim 1, as amended, recites a rolling seal having, in part:

"a wall...a sheet member extending from said wall, ***said sheet member being resiliently coiled about at least a portion of said wall,***" (emphasis added)

Kellner '596 does not anticipate Claim 1 because Kellner '596 fails to disclose a "sheet member being resiliently coiled about at least a portion of the wall." Kellner fails to disclose or mention any coiling, and rather to the contrary, explicitly discloses that the fastening strip is "tangential to the circumference of the tube," (Column 1, Line 71). As the fastening strip is tangential, as illustrated in Figures 3 through 5 of Kellner '596, it cannot be coiled about any portion of the tube as in Applicant's Claim 1. Moreover, Kellner '596 states that "the adhesive of the strip 3 is a permanent adhesive which facilitates the fastening of the packing to the frames," (Column 2, Lines 5-6). Since the adhesive on the fastening strip of Kellner is permanent, the fastening strip is physically unable to resiliently coil about the tube, and therefore cannot anticipate the resiliently coiled sheet member as in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Because Kellner '596 does

not anticipate amended Claim 1, amended Claim 1 is believed to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Applicant's amended Claim 2, states, in part, "an extension member joined to said sheet member." The Examiner states on Page 7 of the Office Action that Kellner '596 discloses "an extension member 3." However, Kellner '596 discloses "the fastening strip 2 consists of adhesive material or is covered with an adhesive layer 3," (Column 1, Line 72- Column 3, Line 1). The adhesive layer coats the fastening strip of Kellner '596, and is not "an extension member" as indicated in Applicant's Claim 2. Because Kellner '596 does not anticipate amended Claim 2, amended Claim 2 is believed to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Further, Claims 3-4, and 7 are believed to be allowable as they depend from amended Claims 1 and 2, respectively. Claim 9 has been cancelled.

On page 7 of the Office Action, Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kellner as applied to claims 1-4, 7 and 9 above, and further in view of Brown, U.S. Patent No. 2,662,053. For the reasons stated above, Claim 5 is believed to be allowable as it depends from amended Claim 2, which depends from amended Claim 1.

On page 7 of the Office Action, Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kellner as applied to claims 1-4, 7 and 9 above, and further in view of Naramore, U.S. Patent No. 1,580,071. For the reasons stated above, Claim 6 is believed to be allowable as it depends from amended Claim 2, which depends from amended Claim 1.

On page 8 of the Office Action, Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kellner as applied to claims 1-4, 7 and 9 above, and further in view of Hast,

U.S. Patent No. 4,084,348. For the reasons stated above, Claim 8 is believed to be allowable as it depends from amended Claim 1.


On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Claims 15-18 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office Action. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter. Claim 15 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, and thus is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 16-18 are believed to be allowable as they depend from amended Claim 15.

For all of the above reasons, the claim objections are believed to have been overcome placing Claims 1-8 and 15-18 in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

Date: January 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Allen D. Brufsky
Reg. No.: 21056
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.
200 East Las Olas Boulevard, Suite 2040
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Customer No. 31292
Tel: (954) 828-1488
Fax: (954) 828-9122